DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 733 EA 021 222

TITLE	Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: The North Carolina Story. Notes on Reform.
INSTITUTION	National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Charlottesville, VA.
PUB DATE	Aug 89
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications, National Policy Board for Educational Administration, University of Virginia, 405 Emmet Street, Ruffner Hall, Charlottesville, VA 22903 ($6.50 prepaid).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Administrator Qualifications; Curriculum Development; Degrees (Academic); *Educational Change; *Fellowships; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Interviews; *Management Development; Supervisor Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS	*North Carolina

ABSTRACT

In November 1986, the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina accepted a recommendation of its Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers. The Task Force called upon the president to conduct a study for the purpose of designing a rigorous Doctor of Education program as a first professional degree program for senior school administrators. The president appointed a committee to develop a new Doctor of Education program for North Carolina. This document presents a conversation providing insight into the new program. An interview was conducted with Dr. Donald J. Stedman, associate vice-president for academic affairs, the University of North Carolina, and staff assistant to the Doctor of Education committee. The topics of the discussion included: (1) curriculum issues; (2) reform proposals; (3) important features of the new program; (4) fellowships; (5) recruitment plans; (6) campus commitment; (7) faculty involvement; (8) administrator fears; (9) implementation stumbling blocks; and (10) the future of North Carolina's educational leadership program. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED312733

ng
eparation
hool
inistrators
s on Reform

The North Carolina Story

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terry R. Astuto

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Publication of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration

EA 021 222

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTES ON REFORM

No. 1, August 1989

The National Policy Board For Educational Administration

Headquartered at

University of Virginia
Curry School of Education
183 Ruffner Hall
Charlottesville, VA 22903

The North Carolina Story

NOTES ON REFORM

Notes on Reform is a publication of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. The purpose of this series is to disseminate information about programs, projects, ideas, or issues related to the improvement of preparation programs for school administrators. Program descriptions, project evaluations, strategies for improvement, research reports, policy proposals, think pieces -- or any other form of information about innovations or proposed program improvements in educational administration -- could be a source of ideas for others interested in reforming our field. Manuscripts should be forwarded to staff headquarters for the National Policy Board: University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, 405 Emmet Street, Charlottesville, VA 22903. (804-924-0583), Attention Terry A. Astuto or Linda C. Winner, Co-Editors.

THE NORTH CAROLINA STORY

In November, 1986, the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina accepted a recommendation of its Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers. The Task Force called upon the President "to conduct a study in 1987-88 for the purpose of designing a rigorous Ed.D. program as a first professional degree program for senior school administrators" (The Education of North Carolina's Teachers, November 1986, p. 58).

In response, the President appointed a nine-person committee representing a broad range of educational experience and professional background to: (1) study the current Ed.D. programs in educational administration in North Carolina and elsewhere; (2) estimate the essential characteristics of successful educational administrators in North Carolina; and (3) develop a new and improved program proposal for senior school administrators (The Education of North Carolina's Teachers: A Doctoral Program for Senior School Administrators, September 1988, p. 4).

The result of the Committee's work is a rigorous new Ed.D. program for North Carolina currently in the initial stages of implementation.

The following conversation provides insight into the new Ed.D. program. The questioner is Dr. Linda C. Winner, Director of Education and Executive Development, University of Virginia Center for Public Service. The respondent is Dr. Donald J. Stedman, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, The University of North Carolina. Dr. Stedman served as the staff assistant to the Ed.D. Committee.

WHAT LED TO THE PROPOSAL TO REFORM EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION IN NORTH CAROLINA?

Three things. First of all, for a long time we have had an access problem. All of our doctoral programs are in the middle of the state. Our remedy was to get each of our existing programs to offer its Ed.D. in educational administration away from the campus in cooperation with another campus--UNC-Greensboro, in cooperation with Western Carolina University, UNC-Chapel Hill in cooperation with UNC-Charlotte, and North Carolina State in cooperation with East Carolina University. These are all operating now and about 250 people are in that pipeline. Participants are full-time school administrators who are in some stage of their work. That's a pretty hefty pipeline for a statewide program. And that has worked fairly well. It has provided access, but to a very limited group--school administrators. It hasn't provided access to the second grade teacher who wants to go into a school administration program. It hasn't provided access to an IBM executive who wants to go into school administration. But we did get funds from the North Carolina Legislature "to strengthen public schools" so we limited enrollment to full-time school administrators. We are now in the fifth year, and the pressure for access has been reduced, but it has created other pressures.

Secondly, the type of advanced graduate education that was being provided in the off-campus sites was pretty much the same as that being offered on the main campuses. It became even more obvious that the doctoral programs in educational administration did not have a perfect fit with what senior school administrators needed to be effective. That was, in part, due to the fact that there was not much difference on the campuses between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. In Chapel Hill you couldn't tell the difference in terms of the requirements. So we began asking, "Are these programs, wherever they are, offering what's needed to produce the type of person we need to be effective as a school administrator?"

YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT CURRICULUM ISSUES.

That's right. So there were access and curriculum problems.

The third dimension is a little more abstract, but it was encountered in the course of the work of our Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers. You may ask yourself why this study came out of a task force that was a teacher education reform effort. In the course of the hearings, the Task Force kept hearing from teachers that they had the "right to be well led," and they didn't think that was happening; that classroom teachers ought to have the opportunity for advanced administrative work, and that wasn't happening. Also, in the context of the teacher evaluation discussions, many of the teachers were saying, "I don't mind being evaluated if these administrators know what they are doing. The education of administrators and their own experience doesn't include an understanding of evaluation. If I'm going to be evaluated by somebody, I want to be evaluated by somebody I feel is qualified to do it." So that was whirling around, and frankly, we saw an opportunity in the task force report for a legitimate vehicle to address the school leadership training issues that had been festering for half a dozen years.

So, we said, okay, let's pull all this together. Let's address the curricular and access issues. Let's try to do something that's way up front; let's not just react. Let's take a hard look at what we've got and say what we should have. If this is what we ought to have, then let's do it! Let's bring the institutions along if they'll come, but let's use the best informed people to devise a program that's patterned after a professional program and not a research Ph.D., and see if we can hatch a program that is responsive. That's how it developed.

WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT FEATURES OF THE NEW PROGRAM?

The study committee found that the profession of educational administration is just as much in the midst of reformation as the teaching profession. The task of the school administrator has changed in the last few years, and the role needs to be both one of management and leadership. The committee proposed an Ed.D. program that would give each institution approved to award the Ed.D. flexibility within a framework of minimum requirements:

(1) at least three years of post-baccalaureate study including one year of full-time study in residence, and one year of a carefully planned and supervised administrative internship;

(2) use of a cohort training format;

(3) core course requirements;

(4) carefully planned courses and experiences in using tools of research and inquiry that will be useful to practitioners.

The committee toyed with the idea of having it be a graduate school degree, not a degree offered by a professional school. They toyed with a lot of things, including calling it a D.S.A. (Doctor of School Administration). They finally came back to the Ed.D., the professional degree in educational leadership. That seemed to have substance, credence, not just jargon. The committee also said there needed to be at least one year of full-time study in residence somewhere in the course of the experience. The committee went beyond that to say if this is going to work, there has to be scholarship support because, especially in the beginning, these students are going to be mid-career people who are going to have to drop out of their jobs. So we created a model fellowship program.

OH, YES, TELL ME ABOUT THE FELLOWSHIPS.

The model proposed is this. A person admitted into the program would receive one-half of his or her salary, based on the previous year's salary, plus tuition. The fringe benefits would be continued during the year. These fellowships are for full-time public school personnel, not just administrators. These fellowships, at least at the outset, would not be available to non-school personnel.

SO THERE'S NO ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT. THIS COULD GO TO A CLASSROOM TEACHER?

Right. This also improves access. The minimum fellowship would be $15,000. In other words, if you were making $20,000, you would get $15,000. The maximum would be $30,000. So, if you were making $70,000 you would get $30,000. That's pretty handsome. We have formally requested this. The bill has been introduced and has now been passed. The level of appropriation for the first year is $800,000 and the legislature will be asked to double that in the next biennium.

IT DOES SEEM THAT THE POOL OF APPLICANTS WILL BE BETTER IF THE FELLOWSHIPS ARE FOR A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT.

Right, look at the North Carolina Teaching Fellows program, for example. I think we have a larger pool of students applying for undergraduate teaching programs with $5,000 than we would with $1,000. So the size, the attractiveness of the incentive, is important in relation to quality, but also it addresses the access issue for mid-career people, regardless of where they live.

WHAT SORT OF RECRUITMENT PLANS DO YOU HAVE?

First of all, the fellowship fund will be helpful. We will then try to network these programs. In other words, instead of just asking each institution to do its

own thing, communications will go out to public schools from the University's System Office announcing this program, making clear that all the admissions must be handled by the individual institutions.

SO STUDENTS MUST APPLY DIRECTLY TO THE PROGRAM OF THEIR CHOICE?

Right, they will apply directly to Chapel Hill, Greensboro, or NC State, but unlike any other program I know, we will be pushing this program from here. We will not receive applications. We don't want to get into the central office admissions business.

WILL A PERSON ALREADY IN AN EXISTING PROGRAM BE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR A FELLOWSHIP?

They could be. If they are going part-time now and have not met the residency requirement, they would still be eligible. You do not have to be absolutely fresh and wet behind the ears. A master's degree is not required. It will be up to the institutions.

HOW WILL THE PROGRAM ARTICULATE WITH A MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM?

This reform is probably going to call for a restructuring of our master's degrees. We may have another study to determine that. Our inclination at this point is that it would be a curriculum and instruction degree that would link very nicely to the Ed.D. so that one could set a career path, but it would also have enough administration for preliminary certification as a principal. Perhaps it would be basically 15-18 hours of curriculum and instruction and 12-15 hours of administration with conditional or provisional certification in administration for some period of time --three years, five years. That would be up to the State Board of Education.

What you see here is not any great Nobel Prize idea. There isn't any real breakthrough anywhere in any part of it in terms of the curriculum or anything else. The idea of cohorts, the idea of a core, the idea of a residency, the idea of a fellowship -- none of this is new. But as a package it is new. We were able to devise it in such a way that we brought everybody along, everybody bought into it. The climate was right in the Legislature, on our Board of Governors, and in the State Board of Education. So what we ended up with was essentially a proposal that was really a set of guidelines for minimum standards or structures that we then took to the University's Graduate Council. This is not a new curriculum. That is the prerogative of the institutions. But it is a clear structure and set of minimum standards. Some of the mechanisms that you run into on the campus level prevent rapid, or sometimes any, change.

The Graduate Council bought into it in its entirety. They saw the need for a distinction between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. They saw the need for access, though they were concerned about quality.

IT SEEMS THERE WILL BE AN EXPANDED NEED FOR FACULTY ESPECIALLY IF YOU DO INDEED ADD PROGRAMS ON OTHER CAMPUSES. I ALSO SEE THE NEED FOR SOME VERY DIFFERENT KINDS OF FACULTY.

You're right. First of all, the report makes it clear that this is to be a program to prepare administrators and not college teachers and researchers. The question immediately came up, "Can the graduates of these programs be on the faculties of these programs?" And the answer to that question is, "I don't know!" You can't start at the beginning and say these graduates cannot do this or that. That will have to be up to employers down the line. I suspect that in 10 years you may find some graduates of these programs on some faculties. The point is we're not training faculty members with this program. And furthermore, these programs

must tell applicants and enrollees what it is they are preparing them for to make sure they don't have some understanding that when they come out they can just go off and teach at Old Siwash University. What Old Siwash does is up to Old Siwash.

Secondly, regarding faculty, the study committee was clear that this should be a campus-wide activity. In other words, involve the schools of business, the schools of law, the schools of public health, the schools of public administration faculties and even engineering faculties for transportation issues and such as that. It isn't just the school of education or department of education that's involved. That means when we look at proposals from the campuses for Ed.D. program approval, which we will be doing in the next academic year, we will want to see faculties that represent a wide range of disciplines. We'll want to see adjunct or clinical faculty to supervise administrative internships. We're going to want to see the kind of faculty member that is needed to teach organizational research or survey techniques, but we are also going to want experts on economics, finance, the legal issues and so forth. In other words, the old concept of the educational administration faculty having one school law professor and one curriculum person and one something else is outmoded. They simply couldn't handle it, especially because of the cohort feature. There will be enormous volume. If you start playing out what this means for a program, you're talking an annual cohort of 20-25 students. After three years you've got quite a bunch, and they don't all go neatly through in a three-year package.

THEN IT'S THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH CAMPUS, IF IT HAS AN ED.D. IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, TO SEE THAT ALL OF ITS APPROPRIATE FACULTIES BECOME INVOLVED?

Right. There is a planning committee on each campus. The person with whom we are corresponding is the chief academic officer, the vice-chancellor for academic affairs, because it is a campus wide issue. We expect that the degree will be offered by the school of education, the professional school. But it will be an interdisciplinary, interdepartmental program.

HOW WILL YOU DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF A CAMPUS COMMITMENT ASIDE FROM THE WRITTEN PROGRAM PROPOSAL?

We expect to have program site visits. We will be putting together a review panel made up of out-of-state and in-state people to advise the President. That panel will review the proposals from existing programs at Chapel Hill, State, or Greensboro. Proposals from other universities to create new programs will also be reviewed. The newer institutions are in those parts of the state where, if you talk bout access, we've had a big hole for some time. So the problem for the chancellors, the chief academic officers, and the education deans will be finding a proper niche in this new type of program for educational administration faculty members who are up to speed or in line with this philosophically.

THIS WILL BE A CHANCE FOR CREATIVE FACULTY INVOLVEMENT. IT COULD BE A VERY EXCITING TIME FOR FACULTY.

That's true. But it's also going to be very hard work, very hard. It is going to take a lot of physical as well as intellectual energy to staff these programs.

ESPECIALLY IF IT IS NOT GOING TO TURN OUT TO BE OLD WINE IN NEW BOTTLES.

This cannot be a passive, quiet, comfortable little part-time pipeline where people are in it seven or eight years. We've already asked our institutions to take a very hard look at their existing enrollment and ask anyone who has been in there for more than five years what he or she intends to do. We have limited resources and we have to put them where they can do the most good.

IT SEEMS THIS PROGRAM DEALS WITH MANY CONCERNS RELATED TO PREPARING EDUCATIONAL LEADERS. ARE THERE AREAS IT DOESN'T COVER?

One thing that is not covered is the volume issue. We still are faced with talk about needing 2,500 principals in the near future. Even if we started six of these new Ed.D. programs you're talking about a pipeline of only 180-200. This is a program for senior school administrators.

MUCH OF WHAT IS BEING DEVELOPED SEEMS BASED ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT TO BE AN EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATOR ONE NEEDS THIS PROFESSIONAL DEGREE.

Basically, we felt that formal advanced graduate study couldn't hurt, and probably would help. It's hard to measure. I don't know anyone who would ever be able to measure the impact of these programs on the effectiveness of the schools. I don't know how you unthread all that. We go on the assumption that more and better education for teachers and administrators is better for the schools. There is a demand for a more practitioner oriented degree at the doctoral level. This is true not only in North Carolina but throughout the nation.

HOW CAN OTHER UNIVERSITIES OR SYSTEMS IN OTHER STATES ACCOMPLISH A CHANGE LIKE THIS?

You start at the top. You go to the chancellors of the campuses and say we need to be responsive to the public schools and a critical factor is school leadership.

It's better if it comes from the president of a system, but if it doesn't, if it comes from the business and corporate community, or if it comes from the Governor's office, the heads of universities need to understand that one of the best ways their institution can meet their own objectives is to be in good rapport with the public schools. After all the schools prepare their incoming students. This is what we told our board. If you only had two strategies to strengthen the public schools you'd focus on school leadership development and early childhood education. If there's anything we know after 50 years of educational research, it is that the better the management, the better the school; the better the leadership, the better the school and the people in it. They hire better teachers, have higher achievement and so forth. The other thing is, the earlier you go to school, the better you do and the longer you stay. It's just that simple. So, if you can get the university to focus on those two things as a strategy for strengthening public schools then you really have something going. And then you talk about the type of management and leadership skill. Stress that it should be a campus wide endeavor, that the school of education is the focus but not the only part of the game, and you get a commitment from the top leadership at the campus. You don't necessarily have to have the inter-institutional connections. We do because we have a good system that is interlocked and we can move on all fronts, but in another state where they don't have that it can still be done. It would probably take longer.

CAN REFORM OF THIS SORT TAKE PLACE WITHOUT AN INFUSION OF ADDITIONAL MONEY?

I doubt it. We've been going at preparing educational leaders in a kind of half-hearted way. We've never developed the kind of mentorship or internship experience required in medicine or law or the other professions where it has been a legitimate part of the enterprise. For some reason it has not been thought of as necessary in schools of education. It has not been affordable. The fellowships are necessary to support the residency requirement, and fellowships require money.

In the past we have allowed people to collect certificates through part-time study. We have not been serious about where these people were going so we have not provided them with the best preparation for where it is they might be going. That's a problem.

WHAT IS THE IDEAL CLIMATE FOR REFORM?

I think would-be reformers need to develop, at the highest levels, close working relationships between the public schools and the administrative systems of higher education. And you can't get this kind of thing done without the state board of education's help. There has to be a good collaborative environment. You also have to have the support of the constituency, that is the educational administrators who are out there.

HAVE ADMINISTRATORS FELT THREATENED BY THESE CHANGES?

Initially, two things happened. One, they were worried that somehow the profession of educational administration would be denigrated if we removed the Ph.D. and focused only on the Ed.D. However, all that has drifted away as they came to understand better the direction and intent of our new Ed.D. in educational leadership.

Second, educational administrators were worried that we wouldn't take into account what they had to say. The mechanisms of the study committee allayed that fear very quickly, not only in the makeup of the committee but in the hearings we had. We identified three panels of people who were regarded by their colleagues as effective. We brought them in and said, don't tell us what the curriculum ought to be, tell us what you have to do to be an effective school administrator. We really shook out a lot of neat stuff. Then we went from there to the next exercise. These are the kinds of things you have to be able to do. That's how you build curriculum.

WHERE WERE THE STUMBLING BLOCKS?

The Ed.D. study committee really stayed on the quality issue and didn't try to politic with the constituencies. I was afraid early on we would get primarily into an access and volume debate. It soon became apparent that they were serious about wanting a good sound program. We ran into no reaction from local school boards. The big silent majority in this country is still the local school board. You would think that the employers would have a lot to say or more interest. But they did not say word one during the task force exercise, two whole years, not once did we get any communication of interest, up or down from local boards.

The State School Boards' Association basically said, "You send us your report, and we'll let you know whether we'll support it or not." We invited them several times to make a presentation to the committee.

The business community was very helpful. Teachers were very helpful. Administrators were very helpful.

Our biggest problem was with our own faculty who saw some "big plot" to take away their prerogative to create curriculum.

We also had some concerns from school administrators and faculty members around the state that we were inventing a diploma mill that was just going to meet the needs of public school people who wanted a "ticket."

HOW DID YOU DEAL WITH FACULTY CONCERNS?

We dealt with them head on. We invited them to tell us what they'd like to do if they had the chance. We told them we weren't trying to wipe them out; we were trying to help them do their job. We were going to do it with or without their help, but we wanted their help because they were going to be expected to implement the new program.

I ASSUME FACULTY WERE NOT ONLY WORRIED ABOUT THEIR PREROGATIVE TO CREATE CURRICULUM, BUT ALSO THAT THEY INTERPRETED YOUR EFFORTS AS CRITICISM OF THE CURRICULUM THEY HAD ALREADY CREATED.`

Some did, but most have been very supportive and see this as a giant step forward that they could not have taken on their own. The new Ed.D. program proposal is not a pre-written curriculum. It is a framework, a set of minimum standards, and a clear set of guidelines that reflect the best thinking of a lot of experts in this field. It also constitutes a sound preparation for professional school administrators.

Individual degree programs, whether they are restructured from earlier programs or are new programs, will still be developed by faculty at the institutions and must still be approved by institutions and the Board of Governors. All of this will take time but we have gotten off to a good start and I hope we see at least one program on line in Fall 1990.

FACULTY SEEM TO BE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT VARIABLE IN THE REFORM EFFORT.

That's right. That's the baseline. The committee agreed that every effort must be made to assure initial and continuing faculty resources with the appropriate professional qualifications and energy. And you can deal with a lot of those issues if you go to the top. We went to the chancellors first. We said, don't start a program unless you really want one, because you will be embarrassed down the line. You will fail unless you are really serious about the quality of the faculty, the appropriateness of the faculty, and a campus-wide scope.

OFTEN EDUCATIONAL REFORM COMES FROM GUBERNATORIAL OR LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE.

Sure, for two reasons. First, there's a big political constituency out there that wants it -- the public as well as administrators and teachers. Also, as I said when I was trying to put the fellowship concept together, here in North Carolina we have a commitment to a public school basic education program that costs $800 million. If we establish six of these Ed.D. programs, and they each have 120 people in the pipeline and each of those persons is getting a $20,000-$30,000 fellowship, that total amount of fellowship money for a total of 10 years is less than 5% of the basic education program. So what you have is an insurance policy. The basic education program will be successful if the leadership understands it and actually implements it in the way it was intended. Legislators should support it because of the enormous investment they are making. And rightly so. They need to make sure it works.

THE CLIMATE SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN RIGHT FOR REFORM IN NORTH CAROLINA. DOES THIS RECEPTIVE CLIMATE EXIST IN OTHER STATES RIGHT NOW?

Yes, I think it does, because this whole scenario of a legislature that has committed itself, and a chief executive who has ridden into office on an educational reform platform, exists in a lot of places. So I think the climate is there. The corporate and business community is supportive. What's lagging behind is the restructuring in the schools of education.

IF PUBLIC SCHOOLS CAN'T BE EFFECTIVE WITHOUT EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP NEITHER CAN SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION. WHERE ARE THESE PEOPLE GOING TO COME FROM?

I don't know where they are going to come from. But, Linda, the universities themselves need to recruit harder. I've watched lots of recruiting efforts for education deans. They don't go after them like they do for law and medicine and engineering. They are more passive. Universities pretty much get what they go after.

YOU SEEM OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE FOR NORTH CAROLINA'S NEW EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM.

Taken in the aggregate I think the program has an excellent chance for success. A regular review by a panel of people of stature who know their stuff will help. Endowed chairs can get each program started with an outstanding leader and the fellowship program will help. I hope five years from today we are sitting here talking about five or six operational programs.

Anyway, that's the story, and I'm excited about it!

ABOUT THE NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration is representative of practitioners, faculty members, and policy makers in the field of educational administration who are committed to reform in their profession. The Board was officially formed on January 20, 1988.

The National Policy Board consists of representatives from the following ten member organizations:

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
- American Association of School Administrators
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Association of School Business Officials
- Council of Chief State School Officers
- National Association of Elementary School Principals
- National Association of Secondary School Principals
- National Council of Professors of Educational Administration
- National School Boards Association
- University Council for Educational Administration

The Board's charter outlines three purposes:

(1) To develop, disseminate, and implement professional models for the preparation of educational leaders;

(2) To increase the recruitment and placement of women and minorities in positions of educational leadership; and

(3) To establish a national certifying board for educational administrators.